

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicant respectfully thanks the examiner for the quick turn-around action on the applicant's latest amendment, and for the very helpful information over the telephone on February 15, 2006, on how to answer the Advisory Action.

The instruction and location to add or delete the paragraph on page 10 of the response is not present. Further, all the changes should be placed on one sheet and labeled "Specification" on a separate sheet. The examiner noticed that more changes to the specification are present in the remarks of page 15. The applicant has put all the changes to the specification in the "Amendments to the Specification" section in this amendment, as shown on the USPTO's web site on the Sample Format for Revised Amendment Practice.

No claim text shall be presented for any claim in the claim listing with the status of "canceled" Canceled claims 2 and 3 have text presented. The applicant has deleted text in the canceled claims.

The new limitation "each said axis of said acute angle bends generally parallel to each other, and generally perpendicular to said right angled bend" in claim 1, lines 13-15, require further search and or consideration. Further, the deleted limitation "unequal" in claim 1, line 10 changes the scope of the claim and requires further search and or consideration. As per the February 15th telephone conversation, the applicant has used the claims that were sent in the applicant's amendment mailed July 21, 2005 as a starting point in amending the claims. Therefore, the new limitation "each said axis..." is deleted and the deleted limitation "unequal" is restored.

Also per the February 15th telephone conversation, the applicant is rewriting claim 2 in independent form, as stated by the examiner on page 9 of the examiner's final Office Action mailed 10/19/05.

The drawings are acceptable; however, the specification is objected since the reference numerals "44" and "45" are no longer in the drawings. The applicant has deleted the reference numerals from the specification.

The applicant respectfully requests one month extension to answer the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment. The final Office Action was mailed on October 19, 2005. Since February 19 is on a Sunday, and February 20 is a federal holiday, this response is being mailed on February 21. A check for \$60 is enclosed in this response.

Claims 2, 5-10, and 15-23 remain in this application. Claims 1, 3-4, and 11-14 have been canceled.

The examiner has acknowledged that claims 15-16, and 18-23 are directed to allowable subject matter. Claim 2 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Claims 8-10, and 17 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Accordingly, since the applicant perceives that the amended claims now comply with all the examiner's objections, are written in current amendment practice, and read over the cited references, the applicant submits that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits. If the examiner agrees but does not feel that the present claims are technically adequate, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner write acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j).

Appl. No. 09/516,655
Amdt. Dated 02/21/06
Reply to Notice of Non-
Compliance of 02/02/06

Respectfully Submitted


Thomas C. Thompson

92-543 Kokole Pl.

Makakilo, HI 96707

(808) 672-3107